IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE	Serial Number	10/055,594
	Filing Date	January 22, 2002
	Title	Language Module and Method of Use with Text Processing Devices
	First Named Inventor	Roland E. Williams
	Examiner	Huyen X. Vo
	Art Unit	2626
	Attorney Docket	P-2180

Mail Stop Appeals
Hon. Assistant Commissioner for Patents   December 2, 2008
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sirs:

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE

   The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 as being unpatentable over Ito (U.S. Patent 6,243,675), in view of Coon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,539,358). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

   Claim 1 recites "A language processing and memory module (i) which is physically attachable to and detachable from an appliance, (ii) which is configured to communicate directly with the appliance when so attached without the use of a network which extends outside the appliance, and (iii) which is configured to perform language-specific tasks at the request of the appliance."

   In rejecting Claim 1 and acknowledging that Ito fails to teach an attachable and detachable language processing module, the Examiner cited Coon et al. as teaching a physically attachable and detachable module.

   In combining Ito and Coon et al., the Examiner citing absolutely no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references in that manner that would have been known by one of ordinary skill in the relevant art(s) at the time the invention was made. In fact, the Examiner provided no reasoning whatsoever as to why such a combination would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art(s).

In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that the currently prevailing law regarding determination of obviousness under Section 103 was laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1966 in the famous *Graham* decision and requires a factual inquiry of resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art(s). Applicant respectfully submits that the record in the instant Patent Application is completely devoid of any factual findings regarding this required element of any obviousness finding. For these reasons, all findings of obviousness in the instant Patent Application are hereby challenged as inadequate as a matter of law.

The Examiner has failed to make a prima facie showing of obviousness of Claim 1 for another, independent reason. The Examiner has not explained how one of ordinary skill in the relevant art(s) at the time the invention was made would, in an obvious manner, combine the docking station of Coon et al. with the system of Ito to produce Applicant's claimed invention. While Applicant acknowledges that a docking station can be physically attached and detached from an appliance, the Examiner has not explained how a docking station can exhibit the features reciting in Claim 1. To the extent some of the components of Ito could be removed from the system of Ito and implemented in a docking station, the Examiner has not established this, let alone that it would be as recited in Applicant's Claim 1 or that doing so would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Ito suggests away from dictionary 30 being detachable, suggesting away from implementation of components in a docking station such as that of Coon et al. Ito relies on the availability of multiple languages to automatically detect a language used by the user. This is taught in Figure 4 at steps S120, S140, and S160 and in the accompanying text in Ito's specification. To properly identify the particular language used by the user, Ito seems to prefer that all possible languages be available to speech control 11 at all times. In contrast, the motivation behind Applicant's detachable language module is described at Page 4, lines 11-16:

> Thus, an appliance can provide a textual interface and be made truly language-independent. To implement a specific language, a language module specific to that language is merely installed in the appliance. In addition, by providing a processing module whose primary function is language-specific processing and which implements a specific interface, such language modules can be used in various types

of appliances to port a specific language from one appliance to another.

Thus, for these additional, independent reasons, the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness of Applicant's Claim 1.

Claim 1 is allowable over Ito and Coon et al. for another, independent reason. Claim 1 recites that the language processing and memory module "is configured to perform language-specific tasks at the request of the appliance." Even assuming arguendo that Coon et al. establishes that dictionary 30 of Ito could be detachable, dictionary 30 performs no processing but rather merely stores words for comparison and recognition by a separate processing module, namely, speech control 11. At column 4, lines 52-67, Ito describes that speech control unit 11 performs all language processing ("compares … to determine the similarities" and "generates … speech"). Figure 1 of Ito shows speech control 11 to be included in central control 10 that performs all the substantive processing of the appliance itself, namely, display, position detection, processing of map data, and processing of user input devices. Thus, Ito suggests away from having language processing performed by a detachable module.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Ito for these several independent reasons. Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons. The Examiner has cited no teaching or suggestion in Bellegarda et al. that is missing from Ito and Coon et al. as discussed above. In addition, all obviousness rejections by the Examiner are inadequate as a matter of law because the Examiner has presented no factual findings regarding the level of ordinary skill in the relevant art(s) at the time the invention was made. Accordingly, Claims 8-9 are allowable over any combination of Ito, Coon et al., and Bellegarda et al.

Claims 1-10 are therefore allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/James D. Ivey/

James D. Ivey
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,016

LAW OFFICES OF
JAMES D. IVEY
11TH FLOOR, TRIBUNE TOWER
409 13TH STREET
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612-2607
PH: +1 (510) 336-1100
FAX: +1 (510) 336-1122
HTTP://WWW.IVEYLAW.COM
JAMES@IVEYLAW.COM